



# Meeting Notes

## Tree & Resources Focus Group Meeting

**4:00 p.m. – Monday, May 18, 2009**

APS Conference Room, 101 West Cherry Ave, Flagstaff, AZ

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

#### In attendance:

**Mark Shiery**, City of Flagstaff (Fire)

Tish Bogan-Ozman, Real Estate

Marilyn Weissman, Friends of Flagstaff Future

Brad Dixon, Engineer

Steve Nelson, Citizen

Mark Spinti, Citizen

Joe Stringer, Citizen

**Roger Eastman**, City of Flagstaff

**Neil Gullickson**, City of Flagstaff

Kent Hotsenpiller, Engineer

**Vince Knaggs**, City of Flagstaff

**Ed Larsen**, City of Flagstaff

**Mark Sawyers**, City of Flagstaff

Steve Gatewood, Wildwood Consulting, Citizen

Collis Lovely, Citizen

Mike Smith, Southwest Forestry Inc.

Ron Hohlfeld, Citizen

Cathy Ann Trotta

Paul Jones, Citizen

Joe Loverich, WLB Group

Rick Schuller, Woodson Engineering

Cynthia White, Friends of Flagstaff Future

Tom Hanecak, Citizen

John Aber, Citizen

Tom Bean, Citizen

Georgia Duncan, Citizen

David Walker, NABA

Guy Zeigler, Shepahrd Wesnitzer

**Karl Eberhard**, City of Flagstaff

Kim Tittlebaugh, Real Estate

## 2. Focus Group Overview

Roger Eastman explained that 11 focus groups have been formed as part of the Land Development Code re-write process.

## 3. Roles/expectations of the Focus Groups

The purpose of the focus group is to “frame the main issues” and try not to get into the “weeds” of each issue. The focus group members will focus on the main issues and determine whether or not the current code supports the issue, or if not, how to get there.

## 4. Roles/expectations of staff

City staff will provide technical expertise.

## 5. Issue review

Mark Sawyers explained the general frame work and the philosophy of the Land Development Code’s processes and procedures for how the current code reviews resource and tree protection. The three key areas are (1) rural flood plain, (2) slope disturbance for 25% or greater or 17-25% slopes and (3) tree protection [residential (50%); commercial (30%) and industrial (20%) of tree resources]. He explained how the protection translated in establishing square footage ratios to the land.

### Key issues identified (White board comments):

- Quality/Location of trees
- Coordination of codes
- Replanting can bring character to neighborhoods
- Bio-diversity
- Flood plains
- Wildlife Corridors
- Preferred plant list for R.O.W. and private
- Forest Reserves vs. site capacity calculations
- Affordable housing vs. Resources
- Are the percentages for calculations and uses correct?
- Integrity of natural resources – maintenance
- Middle ground for consensus
- Simplicity of codes
- Urban Design context
- Replacement schedule for trees (i.e. require trees of different sizes or require replacement before they die)
- Centric Code
- Mining issues – environmental concerns

- Continuation of preservation
- Solar and wind rights – affect on trees
- Regulatory codes (technical aspects – research)
- “Protect” rather than “preserve”
- Maintain Resources within City – flood plain and trees
- Wildland Urban Interface codes (protection of people & property)
- Mitigate and Restoration
- Corps of Engineers – multipliers (reference)
- “Day-lighting” of stream beds back to natural when buried
- Preserve character of older neighborhoods
- Multiple scales approach to measuring resources
- Quality of trees, not just numbers; Also consider location of resources.
- Preserving natural quality so “Wal-mart” site doesn’t happen
- Coordinate Flagstaff Fire Department WUI code with zoning code
- What do we as a community want in terms of resource protection?
- Transect a useful tool for resource protection
- Trees as a sound buffer

#### 6. General comments:

- Knowledge of how the percentage factors were derived. May have to look at other communities
- Consideration to be discussed for TND, smart growth, form based coding
- Forest stewardship relationship with Flagstaff Fire Department
- Prior to 1991, “E” districts required a CUP for development on 25% slopes
- Wildland Urban Interface Code adopted in 2006 along with IFC codes.
- Discussion of how the forest thinning occurs, then the resource percentages are taken – example Camryn Pines subdivision
- “Trees will re-grow” – comment made about how all of old downtown was clear cut, now 40-50 years later, mature, non-native trees have matured
- University Heights held up as an example of tree protection without codes.
- Simplicity important – do right preservation without complex calculations
- Define our focus group goal
- Contributions to resource protection – 404 permits with Corps of Engineers
- Have the 1991 standards for resource protection worked and met the expectations for preservation?
- Since the 1991 code was adopted, reductions in standards have allowed for affordable housing, TND, and design review (regulating architecture)
- Trees as a natural resource help to define the character of Flagstaff
- Roger to talk more about the Transect at next meeting
- The group needs to clearly define its goal
- Look at the city as an ecosystem that is always changing. How can the code promote a dynamic system – e.g. wildlife corridors for migrations

7. Dot mapping exercise for Flagstaff (done late, no real discussion); two maps made

Green: Preserve

Blue: Needs to evolve

Red: Must transform

8. Future meetings:  
First and third Monday of the month at 4:00 p.m. for 1.5 hours, and the fifth Monday of the month when it occurs.

9. Election of a chair person and vice-chair person

Chair person: Steve Nelson

Vice Chair: Steve Gatewood

10. Adjournment  
5:40 p.m.